

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FILING DATE APPLICATION NO. 09/914,794 09/05/2001 Gerhardus Sjoerd Jozef Haak 110510 4100 EXAMINER 25944 01/12/2006 7590 **OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC** SIEFKE, SAMUEL P P.O. BOX 19928 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320 1743

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

_				
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		09/914,794	HAAK ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Samuel P. Siefke	1743	
Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication app Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	
A SHOP WHICH - Extension after SI - If NO pe - Failure to Any repi	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Dons of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Arical for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute by received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC. 36(a). In no event, however, may a reposite apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. lly be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a)∐ T 3)∐ S	esponsive to communication(s) filed on 10/1 his action is FINAL . 2b) This ince this application is in condition for allowards osed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.		
Disposition	of Claims			
4a 5)□ C 6)⊠ C 7)□ C 8)□ C	laim(s) 1 and 3-7 is/are pending in the application) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawalaim(s) is/are allowed. laim(s) 1,3-7 is/are rejected. laim(s) is/are objected to. laim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.		
Application	n Papers			
10)∐ Th A _i Re	te specification is objected to by the Examine the drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the eplacement drawing sheet(s) including the corrective oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine.	epted or b) objected to by drawing(s) be held in abeyanc ion is required if the drawing(s	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)).
Priority und	der 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a) <u>□</u> 1. 2. 3.	knowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority document Certified copies of the priority document Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Ap rity documents have been re u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National Stage	
2) Notice o 3) Informat	f References Cited (PTO-892) f Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) o(s)/Mail Date		Mail Date promal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/914,794

Art Unit: 1743

DETAILED ACTION

Status

This Action is in response to the filing of Appeal Brief filed on 10/17/05. The application is being REOPENED. Below is the new rejection based upon new prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims **1,3-7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fetner et al. (USPN 5,512,168) in view of Forsyth (USPN 6,825,046)

Fetner teaches an extraction process that comprises: conditioning a sorbent in a cartridge by passing a liquid suitable for conditioning though the cartridge (col. 10, lines 26-30; col. 10, lines 49-51); applying a sample that contains the analyte to the sorbent

Art Unit: 1743

by passing a liquid which contains the sample though the cartridge (col. 10, lines 52-54); washing the sorbent by passing a wash liquid through the cartridge (col. 10, lines 55-59); eluting the analyte from the sorbent by passing an elution liquid through the cartridge (col. 11, lines 1-6). Fetner also teaches drying the cartridge receiver tubes for a selected period of time. The gas comprises a dry inert gas. (col. 6, lines 27-30).

Fetner does not teach any information regarding raising or lowering the termperature of the cartridge by flowing a heated or cooled sample through the cartridge.

Forsyth teaches a microextraction process that comprises heating a sample in a vial for extraction (col. 4, lines 15-27). It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Fetner to heat a sample prior to passing the sample through a cartridge because sample uptake on the sorbent is increased with sample temperature. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that if a sample is heated then passed through a cartridge, the cartridge temperature will increase to the temperature of the liquid that is passing therethrough.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,3-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Application/Control Number: 09/914,794

Art Unit: 1743

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel P. Siefke whose telephone number is 571-272-

1262. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on 571-272-1700. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sam P. Siefke

January 6, 2006

Jill Warden
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700

Page 4

rechnology Center 1700